

Iselin, NJ 08830

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING | DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/545,769 | 59 04/10/2000 | | William J Beyda | OOP7572US | 2711 |
| 7. | 590 | 04/05/2005 | | EXA | MINER |
| Siemens Corp | | HOM, SHICK C | | | |
| Intellectual Pro | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 186 Wood Ave | nue South | ART OTHER | I AI EK NOMBEK | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | 09/545,769 | BEYDA ET AL. |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | | Shick C Hom | 2666 |
| Period for | The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address |
| THE M - Extensing after SI - If the pi - If NO pi - Failure Any rep | RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, bly received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed vs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | | |
| 2a)⊠ T 3)□ S | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Northernoons. On the Particle on t</u> | action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro | |
| Dispositio | n of Claims | | |
| 4; 5)⊠ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C | Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are wit Claim(s) 4,5,9 and 10 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 11-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | hdrawn from consideration. | |
| Applicatio | n Papers | | |
| 10) TI | ne specification is objected to by the Examiner ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and acception are not request that any objection to the deplacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrections oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine. | epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Secon is required if the drawing(s) is ob | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |
| Priority un | der 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | |
| 12) | cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage |
| Attachment(s | • | . 🗖 | |
| 2) Notice (3) Informa | of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) lo(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | |

Application/Control Number: 09/545,769 Page 2

Art Unit: 2666

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the limitation that Quality of Service Ethernet layer being modular and wherein the QoS commands are generated or at a modular generate QoS Ethernet layer now recited in claims 11, 12, and 15 is anticipated by Ors et al. in col. 8 lines 45-52 which recite the use of standardized protocols such as the Ethernet switching protocol. The layer being modular merely refers to it being of a standardized design for flexible use and clearly the Ethernet layer of Ors is of a standardized design for flexible use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colley et al. (6,650,644) in view of Ors et al. (6,731,639).

Regarding claim 11:

Colley et al. disclose the method comprising: intercepting a second byte from an Internet Protocol header from an IP layer; identifying from said second byte a quality of service required for individual calls (see col. 6 lines 1-30 which recite using the two QoS bytes of the IP header of the data packet clearly anticipate intercepting the byte from the IP header identifying the QoS); and generating corresponding Quality of Service

Page 4

Art Unit: 2666

commands to a Quality of Service layer to define a Quality of Service (see col. 7 lines 1-11 which recite translating the QoS including the step of generating the QoS lookup table for outputting the type of service TOS according to the translation entry clearly reads on generating corresponding QoS commands as now claimed).

Regarding claims 12 and 15:

Colley et al. disclose the system and method comprising:
beginning an IP multimedia call (see col. 3 lines 16-22 which
recite the inbound IP packet clearly reads on beginning an IP
multimedia call); encapsulating corresponding messages for said
IP multimedia call in IP protocol data packets; setting a second
byte of an IP header at an IP layer for said IP protocol data
packets; reading said second byte before said IP protocol data
packets are sent over a network (see col. 6 lines 1-30 which
recite using the two QoS bytes of the IP header of the data
packet clearly anticipate intercepting the byte from the IP
header identifying the QoS); accessing a lookup table, said
lookup table containing entries for mapping said second byte to
QoS quality of service commands; sending said QoS quality of
service commands to a QoS layer; and sending said IP protocol
data packets over a network using a quality of service as

specified in said QoS quality of service commands at a layer (see col. 7 line 1 to col. 10 line 10 which recite translating the QoS including the step of generating the QoS lookup table for outputting the type of service TOS according to the translation entry clearly reads on accessing a lookup table and generating corresponding QoS commands as now claimed).

Regarding claims 13, 16:

Colley et al. disclose said second byte comprising a Type of Service byte (see col. 2 lines 3-11).

Regarding claims 14, 17:

Colley et al. disclose said second byte comprising a Differentiated Service byte (see col. 1 lines 44-55).

For claims 11-12 and 15, Colley et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the Ethernet layer; the Quality of Service Ethernet layer being modular and wherein said Quality of Service commands are generated at a modular Generate Quality of Service Ethernet layer.

Ors et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach that it is known to provide the Ethernet layer; the Quality of Service Ethernet layer being modular and wherein said Quality of Service commands are generated at a modular Generate Quality of Service Ethernet layer (see col. 6 lines 21-38, col.

Page 6

8 lines 45-52 which recite the use of standardized protocols such as the Ethernet switching protocol, and col. 8 line 35 to col. 9 line 43 which recite encapsulating the IP packet generated by IP packet assembly unit into an Ethernet packet including the label for QoS requirement using Ethernet encapsulation). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Ethernet layer; the Quality of Service Ethernet layer being modular and wherein said Quality of Service commands are generated at a modular Generate Quality of Service Ethernet layer as taught by Ors et al. in the system and method of Colley et al. The Ethernet layer; the Quality of Service Ethernet layer being modular and wherein said Quality of Service commands are generated at a modular Generate Quality of Service Ethernet layer can be implemented by using the Ethernet local area network LAN standard of Ors et al. in the system and method of Colley et al. The motivation for using the QoS layer defining an QoS at a layer being the QoS Ethernet layer as taught by Ors et al. in the method of Colley et al. being that it provides a more useful design and flexible design because it uses a well known local area network LAN standard, i.e. Ethernet, in the system and method of Colley et al.

Application/Control Number: 09/545,769 Page 7

Art Unit: 2666

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 are allowed.

Conclusion

- 5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 6. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick C Hom whose telephone number is 571-272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday with alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 09/545,769

Art Unit: 2666

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SH

DANG TON
PRIMARY EXCEPT FOR

Page 8